

Remarks

With this response, Applicants have amended claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 and adds new claims 9-21. Thus, claims 1-21 are presently pending. Consideration and allowance of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

1. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 1

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,887,266 in view of Beaudou, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,522.

It is respectfully requested that claim 1 be allowed without amendment because the combination of Heinonen and Beaudou fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention. For example, the combination produced by Heinonen and Beaudou lacks messages sent by the detachable microcircuit, e.g. SIM card, being distributed between a module and terminal, as is required by claim 1. The card controlled mobile station 1 of Heinonen is not a communications module as the SIM 19 is part of module card 13, not the mobile station 1. Beaudou completely lacks a communications module.

In addition, neither one of these references disclose, teach or suggest distributing messages sent by the detachable microcircuit between the module and terminal, much less doing so to limit module-terminal connection communications, all of which is required by claim 1. For example, as expressly noted by the Examiner, Heinonen fails to disclose, teach or suggest distributing messages from the detachable microcircuit between the module and terminal in such a manner. Beaudou does nothing to remedy this because messages from the SIM 4 in Beaudou are not distributed between the terminal 3 and any module as Beaudou lacks any such module. Instead, commands are communicated directly between the SIM 4 and the terminal 3 in Beaudou.

In addition, Heinonen fails to disclose, teach or suggest a communications module and terminal in accordance with that recited in claim 1. While Heinonen discloses a SIM module 19 received in a module card 13 that is received in a mobile station 1, the claimed invention only recites a communications module, e.g., communications module 101 of Fig. 1, which includes a detachable microcircuit, e.g., a SIM toolkit card 113. Thus, the claimed invention utilizes only two components, namely the communications module and detachable microcircuit, to accomplish the same thing that Heinonen requires three components, namely (1) SIM module 19, (2) module card 13, and (3) mobile station 1.

Beaudou is also similarly deficient. More specifically, Beaudou fails to disclose, teach or suggest a communications module of any kind as the GSM type radio communications system 1 disclosed in Beaudou only has a mobile station 2 in which a SIM 4 and terminal 3 are located. There is no module that connects the SIM 4 and terminal 3. Indeed, the SIM 4 is directly connected to terminal 3 in Beaudou.

For at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 1 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5 and 6

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected dependent claims 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,887,266 in view of Beaudou, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,522.

Dependent claims 2, 5 and 6 are believed presented in condition for allowance for the same reasons set forth in support of allowability of claim 1. As such, allowance of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected dependent claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beaudou, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,522 in view of Ritter, U.S. Patent No. 6,085,099.

Dependent claims 3 and 4 are believed presented in condition for allowance for the same reasons set forth in support of allowability of claim 1. As such, allowance of each of these claims is respectfully requested. In addition, neither Beaudou nor Ritter, alone or in combination with each other, disclose teach or suggest the communications module filtering the messages in the manner required by each of amended claims 3 and 4. For at least this further reason, dependent claims 3 and 4 are believed presented in condition for allowance and their allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected dependent claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen in view of Ritter.

As amended, independent claim 7 is believed to be presented in condition for allowance over the combination of Heinonen and Ritter. For example, neither Heinonen nor Ritter, alone or in combination with each other, disclose "means to limit the communications on a module-terminal connection and to limit an activity related to a processing of a message of a microprocessor of the terminal" as is recited in independent claim 7. As such, allowance of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 8 is believed presented in condition for allowance for the same reasons set forth in support of allowability of independent claim 7. As such, allowance of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

2. Newly Presented Claims

Independent claim 9 is believed to be presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested. For example, none of Heinonen, Beaudou and Ritter, alone or in combination there with, disclose, teach or suggest a communications module equipped with a processor, memory, antenna that communicates wirelessly with a telecommunications network, and link that connects the module to a terminal that can be a data terminal, such as a personal digital assistant, with the communications module detachably receiving a detachable microcircuit that is configured to facilitate the terminal communicating with the telecommunications network

via the communications module. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 9 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is also believed to be presented in condition for allowance. More specifically, none of the aforementioned references, alone or in combination there with, disclose, teach or suggest the communications device of claim 9 that additionally includes the terminal being a personal digital assistant, the communications module connected to the terminal by a PCMCIA link, and the detachable microcircuit comprising a SIM. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 10 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 is also believed to be presented in condition for allowance. For example, none of the aforementioned references discloses, teaches, or suggests a SIM toolkit card. For at least this reason, it is believed that claim 11 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 is also believed to be presented in condition for allowance. More specifically, none of the aforementioned references, alone or in combination there with, disclose, teach or suggest the communications device of claim 9 that additionally includes the terminal being a personal digital assistant, the link being a wireless link, and the detachable microcircuit being a SIM. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 12 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 is also believed to be presented in condition for allowance. For example, none of the aforementioned references discloses, teaches, or suggests a Bluetooth wireless link. For at least this reason, it is believed that claim 13 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 is also believed to be presented in condition for allowance. For example, none of the aforementioned references discloses, teaches, or suggests a SIM toolkit card. For at least this reason, it is believed that claim 14 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 15 is believed to be presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested. For example, none of Heinonen, Beaudou and Ritter, alone or in combination therewith, disclose a communications system that includes a terminal, such as a data terminal, like a personal digital assistant, that is connected by a link to a communications module that has a processor, memory, and antenna for wireless communication with a telecommunications network, and a detachable microcircuit detachably attached to the communications module that is configured to enable the terminal to communicate with the telecommunications network to manage e-mail, access the Internet, or access a subscription service. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 15 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 is believed to be presented in condition for allowance. For example, none of the aforementioned references, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the system of claim 15 where the terminal memory holds a detachable microcircuit instruction set, and the memory of the communications module holds detachable microcircuit instruction codes. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 16 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 is also believed to be presented in condition for allowance. For example, none of the aforementioned references, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the system of claim 16 where the detachable microcircuit includes a processor and memory that holds instruction codes for the processor. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 17 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 is believed to be presented in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons that claim 17 is believed to be allowable. Therefore, for at least this reason, it is believed that claim 18 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 is believed to be presented in condition for allowance because, for example, none of the aforementioned references, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a communications system that employs a SIM toolkit card. Therefore, for at least this reason, it is

believed that claim 19 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 20 is believed to be presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested. For example, none of Heinonen, Beaudou and Ritter, alone or in combination therewith, disclose a communications system that includes a personal digital assistant that includes a memory that holds SIM message instructions, a communications module as defined in claim 20 that communicates with a cellular telecommunications network and that includes a link that connects the module to the personal digital assistant, and a SIM connected to the communications module that is configured to enable the personal digital assistant to communicate with the cellular telecommunications network to manage e-mail, navigate the Internet, or access a subscription service. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 20 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 is believed to be presented in condition for allowance because, for example, none of the aforementioned references, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a communications system that employs a SIM toolkit card. Therefore, for at least this reason, it is believed that claim 21 is presented in condition for allowance and its allowance is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/882,197

Art Unit: 2684

Page 13 of 13

Conclusion and Petition for Three Month Extension

With this response, a check is enclosed in the amount of \$980 for a three month extension of time from July 21, 2004 to October 21, 2004. In addition, the Commissioner is authorized to charge \$498 to Deposit Account No. 50-1170 for the addition of thirteen claims and three independent claims. No other fees are believed to be payable with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1170.

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview with applicant's attorney would facilitate the prosecution and allowance of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



David D. Stein

Registration No. 40,828

Dated: October 21, 2004

USPTO Customer No. 23598

Boyle, Fredrickson, Newholm,
Stein & Gratz, S.C.
250 Plaza Building, Suite 1030
250 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone: (414) 225-9755
Facsimile: (414) 225-9753
Email: dds@boylefred.com